arXiv:1702.02360v1 [quant-ph] 8 Feb 2017

On the entropy of fermionic reduced density matrices

Marius Lemm*

Department of Mathematics, California Institute of Technology
MC 253-37 Pasadena, CA 91125

February 8, 2017

Abstract

The antisymmetry of a fermionic quantum state has a marked effect on its entanglement properties. Recently, Carlen, Lieb and Reuvers (CLR) studied this effect, in particular concerning the entropy of the two-body reduced density matrix of a fermionic state. They conjecture that this entropy is minimized by Slater determinants. We use tools from quantum information theory to make progress on their conjecture, proving it when the dimension of the underlying Hilbert space is not too large. We also derive general properties of the entropy of the k-body reduced density matrix as a function of k: It is concave for all k and non-decreasing for all $k \leq N/2$, where N is the number of fermionic particles. We can apply these general facts to improve the bound of CLR in all dimensions.

1 Introduction

The entropy of the k-body reduced density matrix of a quantum state measures the entanglement of k particles with the rest of the system. The antisymmetry of a *fermionic* quantum state has a marked effect on these entropies. For example, there is no fermionic state for which these entropies all vanish and in this sense, a many-fermion system will *always display non-trivial entanglement.*

This is in stark contrast to the bosonic case. Indeed, there are bosonic states, namely product wave functions, for which the entropy of all reduced density matrices vanishes and such states are completely unentangled from this viewpoint.

One commonly considers *Slater determinants* to be the minimally entangled fermionic states, since they arise from the most natural antisymmetrization procedure. Therefore, one often measures the entanglement of a fermionic state relative to Slater determinants, e.g., in the definition of *Slater rank* [1, 8, 10]. A similar idea appears in

*mlemm@caltech.edu

quantum chemistry, where one separates the indirect electrostatic energy into an "exchange part" and a "correlation part". The correlation part vanishes for Slater determinants, i.e., they are considered to be *uncorrelated modulo antisymmetrization/exchange*.

The intuition that Slater determinants are the minimally entangled fermionic states was recently turned into the following mathematical conjecture by Carlen, Lieb and Reuvers (CLR) [5]. Their conjecture says that the *minimal entropy of a fermionic two-body reduced density matrix is achieved for Slater determinants*. (The value of the minimal entropy is then $\log \binom{N}{2}$ in their convention.) While analogous conjectures can be made for the k-particle density matrices for other values of k, the case $k = 2$ is the most important one for applications to many-body theory. The statement is known when $k = 1$; it was proved by Coleman [7] in 1963.

The conjecture of CLR is part of an effort to better understand the kinds of two-body reduced density matrices that can arise from fermionic pure states. This effort is partly motivated by the N-representability problem in many-body theory.

For further background and results concerning other entanglement measures in many-fermion systems, we refer to [1, 2, 5, 6]. We mention in particular the result of CLR [5] that convex combinations of Slater determinants uniquely minimize the entanglement of formation [3, 4] among fermionic mixed states.

In the present paper, we apply techniques from *quantum information theory*, most notably the monotonicity of the quantum relative entropy under the partial trace, to study the problem posed by CLR. Our *first main result* gives general facts about the entropy of the k-body reduced density matrix of any permutation-invariant pure state as a function of k: It is concave for all $1 \leq k \leq N$ and it is non-decreasing for $1 \leq k \leq \frac{N-1}{2}$ (**Theorem 2.4**). Combining the monotonicity with Coleman's theorem, we can improve the lower bound that [5] proved for the $k = 2$ case. We also find that *all* of the k-body reduced density matrices have non-zero entropy, cf. Remark 2.5 (ii).

In our *second main result*, we prove the asymptotic form of the CLR conjecture when the dimension of the underlying Hilbert space is not too large (**Theorem 2.6**). The proof is inspired by recent work on approximate quantum cloning in collaboration with Mark M. Wilde [9].

2 Setup and results

2.1 Basic definitions and facts

We work on the finite-dimensional Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N}$, where $1 \leq N \leq d$ are integer-valued parameters. The antisymmetric subspace is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_N := \Lambda^N \mathbb{C}^d, \qquad d_N := \dim \mathcal{H}_N = \binom{d}{N}.$$

By definition, an N-fermion quantum state ρ_N is a density matrix (a non-negative matrix of trace one) that is supported in $\mathcal{H}_N$. We can associate to each ρ_N the family of its k-body reduced density matrices

$$\gamma_k := \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\ldots,N}[\rho_N].$$

Here $\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\ldots,N}[\cdot]$ denotes the partial trace over the last $N-k$ variables when we decompose $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N} = (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k} \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (N-k)}$. We use the convention that the partial trace is trace-preserving, i.e. $\mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_k] = 1$.

The quantity of interest is the *entropy of the k-body reduced density matrix*

$$S(\gamma_k) := -\mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_k \log \gamma_k], \qquad 1 \leq k \leq N.$$

We view this as the entanglement entropy associated to the decomposition $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes N} = (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k} \otimes (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (N-k)}$; it gives a measure on the entanglement between k of the particles with the remaining $N-k$ ones.

As mentioned in the introduction, we are interested in *lower bounds* on $S(\gamma_k)$, in particular $S(\gamma_2)$, when ρ_N varies over the set of fermionic density matrices. By linearity of the partial trace and concavity of the entropy, we may restrict our considerations to the extreme points of this set, the *pure states*. By definition, a fermionic pure state is a projector

$$|\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|, \qquad \Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N.$$

In the following, we restrict to the case $\rho_N = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$.

A basic fact that will be important for us is that the entanglement entropy of a fermionic pure state is symmetric under reflection at $N/2$, i.e.,

$$S(\gamma_k) = S(\gamma_{N-k}), \qquad \forall\, 1 \leq k \leq N-1. \tag{2.1}$$

2.2 The conjecture of Carlen, Lieb and Reuvers

Thanks to Coleman's work [7], we have a good understanding of the case $k = 1$.

Theorem 2.1 (Coleman's theorem)**.** *Let $\rho_N = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ for some $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$. Then $S(\gamma_1)$ is minimal for Slater determinants, i.e.,*

$$S(\gamma_1) \geq \log N.$$

Remark 2.2. An elementary computation shows that if $|\Psi_N\rangle = |\phi_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \phi_N\rangle$ is a Slater determinant, then $S(\gamma_k) = \log \binom{N}{k}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq N$. A detailed proof of this fact can be found e.g. in Appendix E of [9].

In [5], Carlen, Lieb and Reuvers make the following two conjectures which would give analogues of Coleman's theorem for $k = 2$. The second statement is an asymptotic (and therefore weaker) version of the first one.

Conjecture 2.3 (CLR)**.** Let $\rho_N = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ for some $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$. Then

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq \log \binom{N}{2}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\text{or at least} \quad S(\gamma_2) \geq 2\log N + O(1), \qquad \text{as } N \to \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

In their paper, CLR derive a strengthened subadditivity inequality for the quantum entropy, cf. Theorem 5.1 in [5]. Applied to the problem at hand, they obtain

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq \log N + O(1), \qquad \text{as } N \to \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

This is off by a factor of two from the conjectured bound (2.3).

2.3 Main results

Our *first main result* gives general properties of the function $k \mapsto S(\gamma_k)$. It allows us to improve the CLR result (2.4) to (2.7) below. For simplicity, we define

$$S_k := S(\gamma_k).$$

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\rho_N = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ for some $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$. The map $k \mapsto S_k$ has the following properties.*

(i) ***Monotonicity.*** *For every $1 \leq k \leq \frac{N}{2} - 1$,*

$$S_k \leq S_{k+1}. \tag{2.5}$$

(ii) ***Concavity.*** *For every $2 \leq k \leq N - 1$,*

$$S_k \geq \frac{S_{k+1} + S_{k-1}}{2}. \tag{2.6}$$

Together with the symmetry property $S_k = S_{N-k}$, this theorem provides restrictions on what graphs can be exhibited by $k \mapsto S(\gamma_k)$.

Remark 2.5. (i) Theorem 2.4 generalizes verbatim to *bosonic* reduced density matrices. (The proof only uses general inequalities and the symmetry property $S_k = S_{N-k}$, which holds for any permutation-invariant pure state.)

(ii) From the monotonicity (2.5) and Coleman's theorem, we get

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq S(\gamma_1) \geq \log N, \tag{2.7}$$

which improves (2.4) of [5].

(iii) In fact, we obtain $S(\gamma_k) \geq \log N$ for all $1 \leq k \leq N$. This shows that, for fermionic pure states, all possible decompositions of the particles into two groups are entangled.

We now consider the asymptotic version of the CLR conjecture (2.3). It claims that the lower bound (2.7) can be improved to $2\log N + O(1)$. Our *second main result* implies this as a corollary, provided the dimension $d \geq N$ is not too far from N.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\rho_N = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$ for some $\Psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$. Then*

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq S(\gamma_1) + \log\left(\frac{N-1}{d-N+2}\right). \tag{2.8}$$

From Coleman's theorem, we conclude

Corollary 2.7. *As $N \to \infty$, we have*

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq 2\log N - \log(d - N + 2) + o(1).$$

In particular, if $d - N = O(1)$ as $N \to \infty$, then (2.3) holds.

Let us explain the role of the dimension d. It does not enter in Conjecture 2.3, meaning that the result should be true for all dimensions $d \geq N$ (in particular for infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert spaces). Since our bound (2.8) depends on d, we can only obtain a version of the conjecture for certain values of d.

Note that Conjecture 2.3 holds trivially when $d = N$, which is the minimal value of d. (Indeed, in that case $\dim \mathcal{H}_N = 1$ and the only available antisymmetric state $|\Psi_N\rangle$ is necessarily a Slater determinant.) Therefore, it is not too surprising that the number $d - N$ enters in the bound (2.8).

We close the presentation with some remarks concerning possible extensions of Theorem 2.6.

Remark 2.8. (i) The conjecture (2.3) is formulated with an $O(1)$ error term, which we can derive from (2.8) for all d in the interval $N \leq d \leq N + O(1)$. If one is content with the statement that

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq 2 \log N + o(\log N),$$

i.e., that the conjecture holds to leading order, then the allowed range of d values extends to somewhat larger intervals, such as $N \leq d \leq N + \log N$.

(ii) In view of Remark 2.2, it is natural to generalize Conjecture 2.3 to any fixed $k > 2$ by *conjecturing* that $S(\gamma_k) \geq \log \binom{N}{k}$, or at least that

$$S(\gamma_k) \geq k \log N + O(1), \tag{2.9}$$

as $N \to \infty$. The proof of Theorem 2.6 generalizes to this case and yields, together with Coleman's theorem,

$$S(\gamma_k) \geq k \log N - (k-1) \log(d - N + k) + o(1), \tag{2.10}$$

as $N \to \infty$. That is, the generalized conjecture (2.9) holds for any fixed $k \geq 2$ when $d - N = O(1)$ as $N \to \infty$.

(iii) It is of course unsatisfactory that the dimension d enters in the bounds (2.8) and (2.10). For instance, the bounds become worse if one takes a fixed state $|\Psi_N\rangle$ and embeds it in a Hilbert space of increasing dimension d. This particular issue can be remedied however: Given a fixed state $|\Psi_N\rangle$, one can restrict from the outset to the Hilbert space $\Lambda^N \mathbb{C}^{d_\Psi}$ where $d_\Psi \leq d$ is the dimension of the support of γ_1. Then, (2.8) also holds with d replaced by d_Ψ. While this allows us to replace the completely arbitrary parameter d with one that actually depends on the state, it does not yield a better bound than (2.8). The reason is that d_Ψ could be very large due to the presence of many small eigenvalues that do not affect $S(\gamma_1)$ very much.

3 Proofs

We now give the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.6. As mentioned in the introduction, they are mostly based on the symmetry property $S(\gamma_k) = S(\gamma_{N-k})$ and the monotonicity of the quantum relative entropy under the partial trace, which we recall now.

3.1 The quantum relative entropy

Definition 3.1. Given two quantum states ρ and σ, their quantum relative entropy is defined by

$$D(\rho\|\sigma) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)], & \text{if } \ker\sigma \subset \ker\rho, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The key property of the quantum relative entropy that we will use is that it decreases under application of the partial trace. Namely, if ρ_{AB}, σ_{AB} are quantum states on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, then

$$D(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \geq D(\mathrm{Tr}_B[\rho_{AB}]\|\mathrm{Tr}_B[\sigma_{AB}]). \tag{3.1}$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We begin with the concavity estimate (2.6), since it is slightly easier. Let $2 \leq k \leq N-1$. By (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &D(\gamma_{k+1}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_k) - D(\gamma_k\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_{k-1}) \\ =&D(\gamma_{k+1}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_k) - D(\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}[\gamma_{k+1}]\|\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}[\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_k]) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Using that $\log(X_A \otimes Y_B) = \log X_A \otimes I_B + I_A \otimes \log Y_B$ and the definition of the partial trace, we can express the left-hand side in terms of S_{k-1}, S_k and S_{k+1} as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} D(\gamma_{k+1}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_k) =& \mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_{k+1}\log\gamma_{k+1}] - \mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_{k+1}(\log\gamma_1 \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k}} + I_{\mathbb{C}^d} \otimes \log\gamma_k)] \\ =& -S_{k+1} - \mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_1\log\gamma_1] - \mathrm{Tr}[\gamma_k\log\gamma_k] \\ =& -S_{k+1} + S_1 + S_k. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this identity to (3.2), we get $-S_{k+1} + S_1 + S_k - (-S_k + S_1 + S_{k-1}) \geq 0$ and this is equivalent to (2.6).

Next we prove the monotonicity (2.5). Let $1 \leq k \leq \frac{N-1}{2}$, so that $N - 2k - 1 \geq 0$. By (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &D(\gamma_{N-k}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_{N-k-1}) - D(\gamma_{k+1}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_k) \\ =&D(\gamma_{N-k}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_{N-k-1}) - D(\mathrm{Tr}_{k+2,\ldots,N-k}[\gamma_{N-k}]\|\mathrm{Tr}_{k+2,\ldots,N-k}[\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_{N-k-1}]) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the convention that $\mathrm{Tr}_{k+2,\ldots,N-k}[X] = X$ if $N - 2k - 1 = 0$. Using $S_k = S_{N-k}$, we find

$$D(\gamma_{N-k}\|\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_{N-k-1}) = -S_{N-k} + S_1 + S_{N-k-1} = -S_k + S_1 + S_{k+1}.$$

Therefore, we have $-S_k + S_1 + S_{k+1} - (-S_{k+1} + S_1 + S_k) \geq 0$ which is equivalent to $S_{k+1} \geq S_k$, i.e., (2.5). This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.6

On $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k}$, we introduce the projector P_k onto the subspace

$$\mathcal{H}_k := \Lambda^k \mathbb{C}^d \subset (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes k}, \qquad d_k := \dim \mathcal{H}_k = \binom{d}{k}.$$

We denote $\pi_k := d_k^{-1} P_k$. Note that $\mathrm{Tr}[\pi_k] = 1$, i.e., π_k is a density matrix (called the maximally mixed state on $\mathcal{H}_k$).

We write $S_k = S(\gamma_k)$. Theorem 2.6 will be implied by the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.2. *For every $1 \leq k \leq N$,*

$$S_k = -D(\gamma_k \| \pi_k) + \log d_k. \tag{3.3}$$

Lemma 3.3. *For every $1 \leq l < m \leq N-1$, we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m] = \pi_{m-l}$.*

We assume that these lemmas holds for now and give the

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Thanks to the symmetry $S_k = S_{N-k}$, we have

$$S_2 = S_1 + S_2 - S_1 = S_1 + S_{N-2} - S_{N-1}$$

Using Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 =& S_1 + \log\left(\frac{d_{N-2}}{d_{N-1}}\right) + D(\gamma_{N-1}\|\pi_{N-1}) - D(\gamma_{N-2}\|\pi_{N-2}) \\ =& S_1 + \log\left(\frac{d_{N-2}}{d_{N-1}}\right) + D(\gamma_{N-1}\|\pi_{N-1}) - D(\mathrm{Tr}_{N-1}[\gamma_{N-1}]\|\mathrm{Tr}_{N-1}[\pi_{N-1}]). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By the monotonicity of the relative entropy (3.1), we get

$$S_2 \geq S_1 + \log\left(\frac{d_{N-2}}{d_{N-1}}\right) = S_1 + \log\left(\frac{\binom{d}{N-2}}{\binom{d}{N-1}}\right) = S_1 + \log\left(\frac{N-1}{d-N+2}\right).$$

This proves the claim (2.8). □

It remains to give the proofs of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. The key observation is that γ_k is a matrix taking $\mathcal{H}_k$ to itself, meaning that

$$\gamma_k = \gamma_k P_k = P_k \gamma_k, \tag{3.5}$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq N$. This follows from

$$|\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N| = |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N| \left(P_k \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(N-k)}}\right) = \left(P_k \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(N-k)}}\right) |\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|$$

and properties of the partial trace. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k =& \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\dots,N-k}[|\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|] = \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\dots,N-k}\left[|\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N| \left(P_k \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes(N-k)}}\right)\right] \\ =& \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\dots,N-k}[|\Psi_N\rangle\langle\Psi_N|]P_k = \gamma_k P_k. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first equality in (3.5); the second one is proved analogously.

Now we use (3.5) to find

$$\begin{aligned} S_k &= -\operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k \log \gamma_k] = -\operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k \log(\gamma_k d_k d_k^{-1})] \\ &= -\operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k \log \gamma_k] - \operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k P_k \log(d_k)] + \operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k] \log d_k \\ &= -\operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k \log \gamma_k] + \operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k \log(d_k^{-1} P_k)] + \log d_k \\ &= -D(\gamma_k \| \pi_k) + \log d_k. \end{aligned}$$

In the second-to-last step, we used the fact that $\operatorname{Tr}[\gamma_k] = 1$, as well as

$$-P_k \log(d_k) = P_k \log(d_k^{-1}) = P_k \log(d_k^{-1} P_k) P_k.$$

This proves Lemma 3.2. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3. This is Lemma 12 in [9]. First, observe that $\operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m]$ maps $\mathcal{H}_l$ to itself by (3.5). Moreover, it commutes with all unitaries U_l on $\mathcal{H}_l$. Indeed, by standard properties of the partial trace and the fact that π_m commutes with all unitaries on $\mathcal{H}_m$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_l \operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m] =& \operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[(U_l \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{m-l}})\pi_m] = \operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m (U_l \otimes I_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^{m-l}})] \\ =& \operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m] U_l. \end{aligned}$$

Since it commutes with all unitaries, $\operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m] = C I_{\mathcal{H}_l}$ for some constant C. This constant is determined by $\operatorname{Tr}[\operatorname{Tr}_{l+1,\dots,m}[\pi_m]] = 1$ to be $C = d_l^{-1}$. This proves Lemma 3.3 and therefore finishes the proof of Theorem 2.6. □

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank Rupert L. Frank and Elliott H. Lieb for interesting discussions.

References

[1] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, *Entanglement in many-body systems*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80** (2008), 517-576

[2] M.-C. Bañuls, J.I. Cirac, and M.M. Wolf, *Entanglement in fermionic systems*, Phys. Rev. A **76** (2007), 022311

[3] C.H. Bennett,G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, *Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), no. 5, 722725 [Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997), no. 10, 2031]

[4] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, *Mixed state entanglement and quantum error correction*, Phys. Rev. A **54** (1996), no. 5, 38243851

[5] E.A. Carlen, E.H. Lieb, and R. Reuvers, *Entropy and entanglement bounds for reduced density matrices of fermionic states*, Comm. Math. Phys. **344** (2016), no. 3, 655671

[6] M. Christandl, N. Schuch, and A. Winter, *Entanglement of the antisymmetric state*, Comm. Math. Phys. **311** (2012), 397422

[7] A.J. Coleman, *Structure of Fermion Density Matrices*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **35** (1963), 668686.

[8] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruß, and M. Lewenstein, *Quantum Correlations in Systems of Indistinguishable Particles*, Annals of Physics **299** (2002), 88127

[9] M. Lemm and M. Wilde, *Information-theoretic bounds on approximate quantum cloning and broadcasting*, arXiv:1608.07569 (2016)

[10] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht (1993)